

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-27 were pending. Claims 3, 7, 12, 19, 23, and 26 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 10, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, and 24 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-11, 13-18, 20-22, 24-25, and 27 remain pending subsequent entry of this amendment.

In the present Office Action, claims 17-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the examiner has objected to the term computer readable medium. In response, Applicant has amended each of claims 17-23 to adopt the language the examiner has indicated would overcome the rejection. Accordingly, these rejections are believed overcome.

Claims 3-4, 7-9, 12-13, 16, 19, 20, 23 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. In particular, the examiner has objected to the terms “mounting” and “unmounting”. As Applicant has amended the claims to eliminate the use of these terms, these rejections are believed overcome.

In the present Office Action, claims 1, 6, 10, 15, 17, 22, 24 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,567,865 (hereinafter “Araki”). Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 17, 21, 22, 24, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,044,367 (hereinafter “Wolff”). Finally, claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 22, 24, 25, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,675,268 [erroneously cited as U.S. Patent No. 6,657,268 in paragraph 6] (hereinafter “DeKoning”). Applicant respectfully submits each of the pending claims recite a combination of features neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. Applicant requests reconsideration of all claims in view of the following discussion.

As amended, claim 1 recites a method including:

“initiating a storage re-allocation procedure in said computer network, wherein said re-allocation procedure is configured to re-allocate a first storage from a first host in said computer network to a second host in said computer network;

determining whether I/O corresponding to said first storage is in progress, in response to detecting said re-allocation procedure has been initiated;

halting said re-allocation procedure in response to determining I/O corresponding to said first storage is in progress;

disabling access of the first host to the first storage and automatically configuring the first host to bypass attempts to access the first storage upon a subsequent reboot of the first host by editing a table corresponding to file systems which are accessed upon boot; and

completing said re-allocation procedure.” (emphasis added).

Applicant submits at least the above highlighted features are neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. The above highlighted features generally correspond to prior claims 3 and 7. In the present Office Action, it was suggested the features of claims 3 and 7 are disclosed by Wolff. In particular, the following portions of Wolff are cited by the examiner as disclosing these features:

“When the volume control module 1266 has read the access and volume privileges from the access control 1206 and volume control 1208 tables, it then engages in a series of commands designed to write those access privileges to the file directories 1174. For example, if it is determined that the volume control table indicates that client 1154 is to have read/write access to physical device 1164, then the volume control module will issue a mount R/W command which, when received by the command receipt module, will cause the file directory 1174 to be updated and to include these privileges. Subsequently, when the file directory 1174 is written back to physical device 1164, then the file directory 1162, resident on the actual physical device 1164, will also be updated. Thus, the access and volume privileges are read from the access and volume control tables and written by the volume control module 1266 to the cached 1174 and physical 1162 file directories. This process can be carried out across multiple physical devices on the basis of an access and volume control table, which resides in only one of those devices in the preferred embodiment;

however, other locations for these tables are possible.” (Wolff, col. 54, lines 37-58).

However, there is no disclosure in the above of “automatically configuring the first host to bypass attempts to access the first storage upon a subsequent reboot of the first host by editing a table corresponding to file systems which are accessed upon boot.” Rather, Wolff merely discloses reading access and volume privileges from control tables and applying those to the file directories. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguished from the cited art. As each of independent claims 10, 17, and 24 recite similar features, each of these claims are believed patentable as well.

In view of the above, Applicant submits the application is now in condition for allowance. However, should the examiner believe issues remain to be resolved, the below signed representative would very much appreciate, and requests, a telephone interview at (512) 336-0388 in order to facilitate a resolution.

**CONCLUSION**


Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-72700/RDR.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Rory D. Rankin  
Reg. No. 47,884  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,  
Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 7/6/05